

Response
Serial No. 09/782,098
Page 7

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-25 and 28-38 are pending in the application, that claims 1-7, 9, 11-31 and 33-37 stand rejected, that claims 32 and 38 are allowed and that claims 8 and 10 are objected to. The Examiner further noted that claims 8 and 10 would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response claims 1-7, 11, 15, 19-25, 28-31 and 33 are cancelled and claims 39-48 are added. In addition claims 8 and 10 are amended and rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims as suggested by the Examiner to place claims 8 and 10 in condition for allowance. Even further, claims 9, 12, 14, 16 and 34-37 are amended to depend from independent and allowable claims 8, 10 and 32, respectively. All other claims are unamended by this response.

In view of the above amendments, and the following discussion, the Applicant respectfully submits that none of the claims now pending in the application are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Thus, the Applicant believes that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

Rejections

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the Erdogan et al. (U. S. Patent 6,211,957, hereinafter "Erdogan").

The Applicant has herein cancelled claim 19 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claim 19 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claim 19 be withdrawn.

Response
Serial No. 09/782,098
Page 8

B. 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moeller (U. S. Published Patent Application 2002/0093643).

The Applicant has herein cancelled claim 25 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claim 25 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claim 25 be withdrawn.

C. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11-21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lee (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,270) in view of Hunsperger et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,773,063, hereinafter "Hunsperger"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1-7, 11, 15, 19-21 and 24, the Applicant has herein cancelled claims 1-7, 11, 15, 19-21 and 24 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7, 11, 15, 19-21 and 24 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claims 1-7, 11, 15, 19-21 and 24 be withdrawn.

Regarding claim 9, the Applicant has herein amended claim 9 to depend from independent, allowable claim 8, which has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to place claim 8 in condition for allowance. As such the Applicant respectfully submits that at least because claim 8 is allowable, claim 9, which depends directly from allowable claim 8, is also allowable.

Regarding claims 12-14 and 16-18, the Applicant has herein amended claims 12-14 and 16-18 to depend from independent, allowable claim 10, which has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to place claim 10 in condition for allowance. As such the Applicant respectfully submits that at least because claim 10 is allowable, claims 12-14 and 16-18, which depend either directly or indirectly from allowable claim 10, are also allowable.

Response
Serial No. 09/782,098
Page 9

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claims 9, 12-14 and 16-18 be withdrawn.

D. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hunsperger as applied to claims 1-6, 9, 15-21, and 24 above, in further view of Heisman (U.S. Patent No. 5,212,743). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant has herein cancelled claims 22-23 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claims 22-23 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claims 22-23 be withdrawn.

E. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Liedenbaum et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,727).

The Applicant has herein cancelled claim 25 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claim 25 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claim 25 be withdrawn.

F. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Liedenbaum et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,625,727) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Hunsperger et al.

The Applicant has herein cancelled claims 28-31 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claims 28-31 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claims 28-31 be withdrawn.

Response
Serial No. 09/782,098
Page 10

G. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hunsperger and further in view of Liedenbaum et al.

Regarding claim 33, the Applicant has herein cancelled claim 33 and as such submits that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of claim 33 has been removed. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claim 33 be withdrawn.

Regarding claims 34-35, the Applicant has herein amended claims 34-35 to depend from independent, allowable claim 32, which has been allowed by the Examiner. As such the Applicant respectfully submits that at least because claim 32 is allowable, claims 34-35, which depend directly from allowable claim 32, are also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of the Applicant's claims 34-35 be withdrawn.

H. 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 36-37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hunsperger and further in view of Liedenbaum et al. as applied to claims 33-35 above, and further in view of Heismann.

Regarding claims 36-37, the Applicant has herein amended claims 36-37 to depend either directly or indirectly from independent, allowable claim 32, which has been allowed by the Examiner. As such the Applicant respectfully submits that at least because claim 32 is allowable, claims 36-37, which depend directly from allowable claim 32, are also allowable.

As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 36-37 be withdrawn.

Response
Serial No. 09/782,098
Page 11

Conclusion

Thus the Applicant submits that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102 or obvious under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103. Consequently, the Applicant believes that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Jorge Tony Villabon, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 x 1131 or Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Eamon J. Wall, Attorney
Reg. No. 39,414

Dated: 11/22/04
CUSTOMER #26,291
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
732-530-9404 - Telephone
732-530-9808 - Facsimile